

REMARKS

This Amendment and Request for Reconsideration is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on 16 November 2006.

In the present Amendment, the Applicant amends claims 1-10, 14-19, and 21; no claims have been added or canceled. The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendment and reconsideration of the claims as amended. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been entered; the amendment is fully supported by the application as originally filed.

In the Office Action of 16 November 2006, the Examiner allowed claims 11-13 but maintained rejection of claims 1-10 and 14-21. In response, the Applicant respectfully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowability of claims 11-13.

In the same Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 and 14-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on US2002/0165012A1 to Kirbas et al., US2004/0198335A1 to Campen, and US2006/0210046A1 to Smith. In response, the Applicant amends claims 1-10, 14-19, and 21, and submits that the claims as amended are novel and non-obvious over the prior art of record for at least the following reasons.

For a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the prior art in combination must teach or suggest each and every limitation of the claims. In addition, there must be an adequate suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of the prior art.

The present application is directed to restricting particular long distance telephone calls made from a wireless communication device. The long distance restriction information includes information indicative of one or more allowable/disallowable country codes or area codes. According to the present application, these restrictions are provided through use of a host enterprise server of a private communication network of an enterprise which includes an individual user of the wireless device and which is

outside of the wireless network within which the wireless device operates. The long distance call restrictions may be, for example, managed by an IT department of a corporation which has authority or control over the wireless device. Preferably, the host enterprise server has the long distance call restriction information stored in a user profile for the individual, which is one of a plurality of user profiles for individuals of the enterprise. Also preferably, the host enterprise server is further configured to regularly synchronize data items between an application of the wireless device and the host enterprise server, for each one of the wireless communication devices for individuals of the enterprise.

The present invention as defined by the amended claims is advantageous over the prior art of record in that *private* control may be provided for restricting long distance calls, separate from the governing wireless and telephony network, in a flexible and convenient manner for enterprises such as companies and corporations, with use of a host enterprise server.

With respect to claims 1-10 which have been rejected based primarily on the Kirbas et al. and the Campen references, these claims have been amended to more closely correlate with limitations of allowable claims 11-13. Claims 1-10 as amended now recite the limitations “the host enterprise server having the long distance call restriction information stored in a user profile which is unique to the individual and being one of a plurality of user profiles for individuals of the enterprise,” in combination with the existing claim limitations.

The prior art alone and in combination fail to teach or suggest, amongst other things, a host enterprise server in a private communication network of an enterprise which is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates, where the host enterprise server has the long distance call restriction information stored in a user profile which is unique to the individual, and where the user profile is one of a plurality of user profiles for individuals of the enterprise.

The Kirbas et al. reference merely mentions in passing that “the instruction set and the database can be downloaded via the antenna 210 of the transceiver 140” (see Kirbas et al. in paragraph 26 at lines 5-8), but otherwise mentions little if anything regarding where the information may be obtained from, especially regarding wireless network techniques. The Campen reference does not teach or suggest a host enterprise server having a user profile which is unique to the individual, and being one of a plurality of user profiles for individuals of the enterprise. Even further, Kirbas et al. and Campen fail to teach or suggest that the same host enterprise server is utilized to regularly synchronize data items between an application of the wireless device and the host enterprise server (see e.g. dependent claims 3 and 8).

Since the prior art fails to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1-10 as amended, and such modifications are not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw such rejections and allow the claims as amended.

With respect to claims 14-19 and 21 which have been rejected based on the Kirbas et al., the Boltz et al., and Smith references, these claims have been amended clearly recite that the host enterprise server that receives and responds to the query request is in a private network of an enterprise which is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates. In addition, these claims have been amended to further clarify that the query request is performed in response to a telephone call attempt from the wireless device to a telephone number which is subject to the potential long distance call restriction.

The prior art alone and in combination fail to teach or suggest, amongst other things, that the query request is made to a host enterprise server in a private network of an enterprise which is outside of the wireless communication network within which the wireless device operates. In Smith, the primary focus of the relevant network is in connection with a *telecommunications provider* (see e.g. Smith in paragraphs 5, 15, and 52. Although Kirbas et al. describe an administrator of an employer which may facilitate

the programming of a wireless device, such programming does not relate to a query request received at a host enterprise server of a wireless network for area codes and country codes for long distance restriction.

Even further, Boltz do not teach or suggest the use of a host enterprise server of a private network of an enterprise (e.g. managed by an IT department) for maintaining storage of long distance restriction information. Instead, Boltz teaches the use of a database in the SS7 signaling network (not a private network of an enterprise which includes the individual) or other public databases/networks. Thus, private control by the enterprise may not be easily obtained by Boltz. The Boltz reference does not even relate to area codes and country codes for long distance restriction, but rather to a Selective Carrier Denial feature as argued in previous responses by the Applicant.

Finally, the query request of the present invention is performed in response to a telephone call attempt from the wireless device to a telephone number which is subject to the potential long distance call restriction. No query request of the prior art relates to any such triggering.

Other arguments for patentability are apparent but considered moot in light of arguments already presented.

The Applicant request entry of this Amendment and reconsideration of the claims. The Applicant respectfully submits that the application as amended is now in a condition suitable for allowance.

Thank you. Please feel free to contact the undersigned if it would expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/John J. Oskorep/

Date: 13 March 2007

JOHN J. OSKOREP
Reg. No. 41,234

JOHN J. OSKOREP, ESQ. LLC
ONE MAGNIFICENT MILE CENTER
980 N. MICHIGAN AVENUE, SUITE 1400
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611 U.S.A.

Telephone: (312) 222-1860 Fax: (312) 475-1850